

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,036,091 to Nguyen (“*Nguyen*”) in view of U.S. Patent No 6,819,344 to Robbins (“*Robbins*”), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,717 to Vayda et al. (“*Vayda*”).

By this amendment, Applicants propose to amend claims 1 and 5, and cancel claims 3 and 7 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-14 would be pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda*. Because claims 3 and 7 are cancelled, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for displaying an electronic equipment input state on a menu screen, including “adding second icons, upon selecting the highlighted icon, at predetermined intervals on the second ring, the second icons corresponding to secondary operations of the operation,” and “removing detail from the first icons after adding the second icons.” *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* fail to teach or suggest the claimed “removing.”

With respect to Figure 5, *Nguyen* discloses first menu 420 *Nguyen*, col. 7, lines 49-55. By selecting an option on first menu 420, a second menu 520 can be displayed. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 55-58. However, *Nguyen*’s first menu does not change after second menu 520 is included in the display. Accordingly, *Nguyen* does not teach or suggest “removing detail from the first icons after adding the second icons,” as recited in claim 1.

With respect to Figure 12, *Robbins* discloses wheel 352 around a portion of helical path 340. Wheel 352 provides data associated with the portion of helical path 340, for example, programming available at a time corresponding to the portion of helical path 340. *Robbins*, col. 10, lines 30-51. However, *Robbins*'s portion of helical path 340 does not change after wheel 352 is displayed. Accordingly *Robbins* does not teach or suggest "removing detail from the first icons after adding the second icons," as recited in claim 1.

Vayda fails to cure the deficiencies of *Nguyen* and *Robbins*. *Vayda* fails to teach or suggest "removing detail from the first icons after adding the second icons," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* fail to teach or suggest claim 1.

Independent claim 5, while of different scope than claim 1, distinguishes over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 4 and 8-14 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 5.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims, as amended, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references. Applicants

therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 20, 2008

By:


Fahd Hussein Patel
Reg. No. 61,780
(202) 408-6072